REMARKS

By the foregoing amendments, Applicant has canceled claims 4, 6, 24 and 26 and revised claims 1 and 21 to define their contribution to this art with more precision. Following these amendments, claims 1 to 3, 5, 7, 8, 12 to 14, 16, 19 to 23, 25, 27, 28, 32 to 34, 36, 39 to 44 are pending in the application, of which claims 1 and 21 are independent claims. Favorable reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

As an initial matter, Applicant has supplied the missing serial numbers for the cited co-pending applications on pages 7 and 40 of the specification.

The Examiner rejected claims 1 to 8, 12 to 14, 16, 19 to 28, 32 to 34, 36 and 39 to 44 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for allegedly being unpatentable over VALEX User Guide (hereinafter Valex) in view of Resnick, Rosalind, "Netcreations Releases Postmaster Direct Response 2.0 Real-Time List Ordering System for the Web" (hereinafter Netcreations). In view of the above-mentioned amendments, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of these rejections.

Amended claim 1 describes a method of acquiring a list of prospective customers over a computer network. The prospective customer list includes one or more attributes for each prospective customer on the list. The method includes receiving a location of the list on the computer network from a client system, retrieving the list from the location, and formatting the list for storage in a database of prospective customer lists. The formatting facilitates searching and retrieval of the list and data included from the database; and it further includes identifying the attributes included in the list received from the client system and comparing the identified attributes with database attributes. Each database attribute is

9

pre-defined by the database of prospective customer lists and has a pre-defined format. The formatting further includes creating a new database attribute for an identified attribute if no match is determined between the identified attribute and a database attribute. The method also includes storing the formatted list in the database of prospective customer lists.

Neither the Valex reference nor the Netcreations reference discloses or suggests the foregoing features of claim 1. In particular, the references do not teach formatting a list for storage into a database by "creating a new database attribute for an identified attribute if no match is determined between the identified attribute and a database attribute," as in Applicant's amended claim 1.

Instead, Valex describes a system for transforming "raw data information" into "usable marketing information." *See* pg. vii. The data information, however, is already pre-loaded into the system. Thus, the Valex system merely manipulates this data information into usable marketing information. For example, the Valex system may create a new table target in order to generate reports, graphs and presentations of the data. *See e.g.*, pg. 2-5.

Nowhere does the Valex reference disclose or suggest formatting and storing new data information into the system's database. Thus, *a fortiori*, the Valex reference cannot disclose or suggest a method of formatting that includes creating a new database attribute for an identified attribute if no match is determined between the identified attribute and a database attribute, as in Applicant's amended claim 1. Neither does the Netcreations reference supply the missing features of claim 1. For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that claim 1 is patentable over the Valex and Netcreations references.

10

Amended claim 21 is a computer-readable storage medium claim that corresponds, roughly, to claim 1. For at least the same reasons, Applicant submits that claim 21 is patentable over the Valex and Netcreations references.

Each of the dependent claims is also believed to define patentable features of the invention. Each dependent claim partakes of the novelty of its corresponding independent claim and, as such, has not been discussed specifically herein.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

11

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicant hereby requests any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee, that is not covered by an enclosed check, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 06-1448, reference NMC-001.01.

Respectfully submitted,

Ruth J. Ma
Reg. No. 55,414
Attorney for Applicant
Tel. No. (617) 832-1257
Fax. No. (617) 832-7000

Date: September 19, 2005
Customer No: 25181
Patent Group
Foley Hoag, LLP
155 Seaport Blvd.
Boston, MA 02210-2600

12